

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1 and 3-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1-10, 15, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman et al. (US Patent 6,243,707) in view of Wugoski (US Patent 6,690,392). Claims 11-14 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Wugoski as applied to claims 1-10 above, and further in view of what was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

By this Amendment, Applicants hereby incorporate the subject matter of claim 2 into claim 1, and cancel claim 2 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Preliminary Matters

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering and initialing the references submitted in the Information Disclosure Statements filed on May 6, 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10, 15, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman et al. (US Patent 6,243,707) in view of Wugoski (US Patent 6,690,392).

As amended, claim 1 incorporates claim 2, and recites, in part, “wherein the control unit comprises a database server and a remote control proxy server.” According to page 7 of the instant Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the subject matter of claim 2 is rendered obvious by a combination of Humpleman and Wugoski. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Referring to page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the database server recited in claim 1 (original claim 2) corresponds to the session manager disclosed in *Humpleman*, column 14, lines 38-42.

According to *Humpleman*, column 14, lines 38-42, the session manager sends the command and the control information to the managed device. However, the database server recited in claim 1 collects the remote control service list information and manages the collected information. That is, claim 1 recites collecting and managing the remote control service list information, whereas *Humpleman* discloses that the session manager sends the command and the control information to cause communication. In other words, *Humpleman* fails to teach or suggest collecting information as recited in claim 1. Thus, *Humpleman* fails to disclose or suggest the claimed database server.

Additionally, on page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the remote control proxy server recited in claim 1 (original claim 2) is disclosed in *Humpleman*, column 14, lines 38-42. The remote control proxy server recited of claim 1 “provides the certain device with the remote control service in accordance with the remote control service list information collected through the database server.” However, *Humpleman* merely discloses that “the session manager sends the command and the control information to the managed device” in column 14, lines 38-42. Moreover, *Humpleman* does not disclose that the certain device is provided with three remote control service “in accordance with the remote control service list information collected through the database server,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, *Humpleman* fails to teach or suggest the feature of the remote control proxy server recited in claim 1, and Wugoski fails to cure the deficiencies noted with respect to claim

1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the Examiner's proposed combination of references.

Claims 3-10, 15, 23 and 24 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claims 11-14 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Wugoski as applied to claims 1-10 above, and further in view of what was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Claims 11-14 and 16-22 depend from claim 1. Because the proposed combination of Humpleman and Wugoski fails to render claim 1 obvious, and because what was well known in the art at the time of invention fails to cure the deficiency noted in the Examiner's proposed combination, claims 11-14 and 16-22 are patentable over the applied art.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dion R. Ferguson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Dion R. Ferguson
Registration No. 59,561

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 26, 2009